



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS  
Washington, D.C. 20231  
[www.uspto.gov](http://www.uspto.gov)

| APPLICATION NO. | FILING DATE | FIRST NAMED INVENTOR            | ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. | CONFIRMATION NO. |
|-----------------|-------------|---------------------------------|---------------------|------------------|
| 09/537,738      | 03/29/2000  | Nadeepuram Kuppanna Ranganathan | II-1                | 7052             |

7590 01/23/2003

Stradling Yocca Carlson & Raut IP Department  
Suite 1600  
660 Newport Center Drive  
PO Box 7680  
Newport Beach, CA 92660-6442

EXAMINER

NGUYEN, JUDY

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

2861

DATE MAILED: 01/23/2003

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

|                          |                        |                     |
|--------------------------|------------------------|---------------------|
| <b>Interview Summary</b> | <b>Application No.</b> | <b>Applicant(s)</b> |
|                          | 09/537,738             | RANGANATHAN ET AL.  |
|                          | <b>Examiner</b>        | <b>Art Unit</b>     |
|                          | Judy Nguyen            | 2861                |

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

(1) Judy Nguyen.

(3) \_\_\_\_\_.

(2) Mr. Norman Carte.

(4) \_\_\_\_\_.

Date of Interview: 19 March 2003.

Type: a) Telephonic b) Video Conference  
c) Personal [copy given to: 1) applicant 2) applicant's representative]

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) Yes e) No.

If Yes, brief description: \_\_\_\_\_.

Claim(s) discussed: 21,24 and 27.

Identification of prior art discussed: Preszler.

Agreement with respect to the claims f) was reached. g) was not reached. h) N/A.

Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: applicant's proposed amendment adds the feature of a poppet into the aforementioned claims. The examiner indicated that such feature overcome Preszler only for the apparatus claims 21 and 24. It does not overcome method claim 27 because the added structure does not manipulate the process of the method.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

i) It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview(if box is checked).

Unless the paragraph above has been checked, THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN ONE MONTH FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.

Examiner Note: You must sign this form unless it is an Attachment to a signed Office action.

  
JUDY NGUYEN  
PRIMARY EXAMINER

Examiner's signature, if required